

Garey, Ringgold and Maulsby in opposition to the postponement.

Mr. Farnandis hoped the Convention would take such action as it deemed best, assuring it that the committee would not consider it as discourteous if their report was not adopted.

Mr. Wethered was in favor of a postponement.

Mr. Barnes thought the subject should be postponed, as it was of too momentous importance to be passed over lightly.

The motion to postpone was lost.

The substitute proposed by Mr. Devries was rejected.

The substitute proposed by Mr. Barnes was rejected by a vote of 90 to 6.

Mr. Morris moved to amend the first section by striking out the word "taxation," and insert after the word "by" a tax of 10 cents in each \$100 of the assessable property of the State.

Mr. Vansant maintained that the section should be adopted as it came from the committee. The committee was large, it was composed of twenty-four members, and the attendance on the deliberations of the committee had invariably been full. Every subject had been thoroughly considered by the committee, and all these propositions, which were also offered there, had been voted down. The future details of the system should be left to the Legislature, which would assemble in January next after the adoption of the constitution. The attention of the members of the Legislature would be drawn to this matter, and they would provide for it as the occasion may demand. He did not, as some seemed to believe, that when this Convention adjourned the doors of legislative wisdom in this State would be closed forever. He had every confidence in the integrity, ability and patriotism of the men who would be likely to compose the next General Assembly, and had no doubt that they would give to Baltimore her own system. In the deliberations of the committee they had fully arrived at the conclusion that the city system would not suit in the counties.